REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stone et al., UNIX Fault Management: A Guide for System Administration, Chapters 3-6 and 9, hereinafter "Stone". Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 provides a method carried out by a status engine for monitoring services of an information technology (IT) environment. The method includes storing a representation of a service hierarchy, the stored representation including service elements representing the services of the IT environment. Each service element has an associated service status. The service hierarchy includes superordinate and subordinate service elements, and the status of a superordinate service element depends on at least one of the statuses of one or more subordinate service elements.

The method includes calculating the status of a superordinate service element by considering status dependency and propagation between service elements within the service hierarchy according to one or more rules. The rules define the dependency of the status of the superordinate service element on at least one of the statuses of one or more subordinate service elements and the propagation of one or more statuses from one or more subordinate service elements to the superordinate service element.

The rules include at least one of a) a rule that is based on additional attributes of the service element other than the status, b) a rule that ignores subordinate service elements, c) a rule that is defined by a user on the basis of at least one of i) logical and ii) arithmetical operations of the status or said additional attributes of subordinate service elements, and d) a rule that is programmed individually by a user.

Stone discloses tools and methods for fault management, which includes the process of detecting, reporting and reacting to faults or events taking place in a computing environment (Chapter 2, page 4, lines 13-14).

The Office Action, and particularly in the Advisory Action dated July 14, 2005, contends that Stone's Seagate NerveCenter, by including "rules-base filtering" and a "model" for monitoring the status of network, discloses calculating the status of a superordinate service element "by considering status dependency and propagation between the service model elements within the service model." Applicant disagrees.

Stone discloses the "Seagate NerveCenter", which provides network event correlation and behavior management for UNIX and NT systems (Chapter 9, page 254, lines 6-7). Seagate uses rules-based filtering and advanced correlation to pinpoint root causes and help manage the volume of critical network issues and events in the enterprise (Chapter 9, page 254, lines 7-8). Behavior models are used to define the relationships between critical conditions and specific corrective actions, and Seagate comes with several predefined models for monitoring network traffic, performance, status, security, and error conditions (Chapter 9, page 254, lines 19-21).

Stone, in its description of Seagate, discloses "behavior models" for defining relationships **between certain conditions and specific corrective actions**, but does not disclose defining relationships between network elements. In contrast, claim 1 provides a "service hierarchy" that includes dependency relationships between services of an IT environment. Therefore, Stone's description of Seagate does not disclose dependency relationships between service elements, and thus Stone does not disclose calculating the status of a superordinate service element of a service hierarchy by considering status dependency and propagation **between service elements within the service hierarchy**.

Thus, Stone does not disclose a method for calculating the status of at least one superordinate service element "by considering status dependency and propagation between service elements within the service hierarchy," nor does Stone disclose rules that "define the dependency of the status of the superordinate service element on at least one of the statuses of one or more subordinate service elements and the propagation of one or more statuses from one or more subordinate service elements to the superordinate service element," as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Stone fails to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Stone.

Claims 2-8 and 21 depend from claim 1. For at least reasoning similar to that provided in support of the patentability of claim 1, claims 2-8 and 21 are also patentable over Stone.

Independent claims 9 and 16 recite features similar to those recited in claim 1. For at least reasoning similar to that provided in support of the patentability of claim 1, claims 9 and 16 are patentable over Stone.

Claims 10-15 and 22 depend from claim 9. Claims 17-20 and 23 depend from claim 16. For at least reasoning similar to that provided in support of the patentability of claims 9 and 16, claims 10-15, 17-20, 22 and 23 are patentable over Stone.

For the reasons set forth above, the rejection of claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Stone is overcome. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-20 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

An indication of the allowability of all pending claims by issuance of a Notice of Allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/5/05

Paul D. Greeley
Reg. No. 31,019
Attorney for Applicants
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, LLP
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
Tel: (203) 327-4500
Fax: (203) 327-6401